DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 574 HE 031 765

AUTHOR Estler, Suzanne E.; Harris, Walter J.
TITLE The Homogenizing Effect of Academic Governance: A Case Study in the Creation of a Field-Sensitive Doctoral Concentration in Higher Education. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 1998-11-00
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (23rd, Miami, FL, November 5-8, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; College Administration; College Faculty; *Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; Decision Making; Doctoral Degrees; *Doctoral Programs; Educational Innovation; *Governance; *Higher Education; Leadership; *Postsecondary Education as a Field of Study; Schools of Education; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *University of Maine

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a case study of the initiation of a doctoral concentration in higher educational leadership at the University of Maine. The case study documents the perceptions of curricular needs defined by practitioners in the state, the resulting efforts to develop a field-sensitive curriculum, and the impact of the academic decision-making process on the appearance of innovation as the proposal progressed. It was found that there was a greater convergence in expectations for the focus of the program among external constituents, including employers and potential students, than among College of Education and Human Development faculty. It is concluded that the appearance of programmatic innovation may be compromised to academic form and tradition in the course of academic decision making, while innovation may nevertheless flourish under the autonomy of the faculty member in an individual case. Three appendixes contain integrated and consolidated responses from focus groups, a list of commitments for higher educational leadership faculty, and requirements for the doctor of education concentration in higher educational leadership. (Contains 10 references.) (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 427 574

The Homogenizing Effect of Academic Governance:

A Case Study in the Creation of a Field-Sensitive Doctoral Concentration in Higher Education

Suzanne E. Estler and Walter J. Harris

University of Maine

Paper prepared for the annual conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education

Miami, Florida

November 1998

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 031 765

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. Vaughan
ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ASHE *Association for the Study of Higher Education*

Headquartered at the University of Missouri-Columbia • College of Education • Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis • 211 Hill Hall, Columbia, MO 65211 • 573-882-9645 • fax 573-884-5714

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Miami, Florida, November 5-8, 1998. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Abstract

This paper is a case study of the initiation of a doctoral concentration in higher educational leadership at a land grant university. The case documents the perceptions of curricular needs defined by practitioners in the state, the resulting efforts to develop a field sensitive curriculum, and the impact of academic decision making processes on the appearance of innovation as the proposal progressed. It concludes that the appearance of programmatic innovation may be compromised to academic form and tradition in the course of academic decision making, while innovation may nevertheless flourish under the autonomy of the faculty member in an individual class.

The Homogenizing Effect of Academic Governance: A Case Study in the Creation of a Field-Sensitive Doctoral Concentration in Higher Education

Introduction

Higher education as a field of doctoral study has evolved in mission, clientele and content since G. Stanley Hall's first higher education course in 1893. On the eve of the millennium, a variety of doubts have been expressed about the future of the field as a result of: A trend toward merger into larger academic units (Nelson, 1991; Cooper, 1986); questions about the credibility of the academic strength of the degree (Fincher, 1991; Townsend and Weise, 1991); substantial turnover in tenured faculty due to retirements (Nelson, 1991) and ambiguity about what exactly constitutes the field (Peters and Peterson, 1987).

The proposed responses to these trends are at times contradictory. Contrasting responses range from Fincher's (1991) call for a reemphasis on the preparation of scholars, professors, and researchers to Rhodes (1997) call for greater focus on curricula addressing the needs of the increasing numbers of mid-career professionals whose leadership will be in roles very different from a presidency.

As the merger trends begin to settle out, we are seeing a clear and continuing identification of higher education as a distinct field of study either as a separate entity within a merged unit or in a reemergence as a separate area of study. The recent decision within the University of Maine to reinstitute an EdD focus in higher education leadership provided an opportunity for building a program "from the ground up" which was sensitive to the needs of the field without preconceptions about the program structure and content. This paper is a case study of the efforts to define the program structure and function by identifying relevant stakeholders and providing various methods for input into the program development. It chronicles the unintended effects that institutional processes had on program content and language that described the program as an innovation .

The research on higher education as a field of study has been characterized by comprehensive surveys of students, faculty and presidents (Crosson and Nelson, 1986; Newell and Morgan, 1983). The survey research has focused on specific populations across institutions, free of their interconnectedness with institutional and professional contexts. A case study approach allows exposure to the depth and complexity of the interaction of competing contextual forces within communities of practitioners and communities of scholars.

No case study is truly free of implicit theory guiding choices of relevant data. While every attempt has been made to "follow the data" without regard to a preconceived schema in the tradition of grounded study, discretionary choices in understanding them are guided by an understanding of the university as an organized anarchy (Cohen and March, 1974). This view looks at decision-making in universities as a confluence of at a given point in time of participants, problems, solutions, and competing choice opportunities. This view leads to an analysis of relevant participants (internal and external stakeholders and interests), choice opportunities, and the sequencing in time of related and unrelated problems and solutions.

This paper addresses two questions: (1) Given a voice, what do the stakeholders who would be served by a reconstituted doctoral program in higher education leadership advocate for need, content and structure? (2) What happens in program design as those voices are channeled through academic governance processes?

Methods

This case study is based on the following methods and data sources: A review of documentation framing the efforts of an advisory committee charged with formulating a reconstituted EdD program in higher educational leadership; a review of the outcomes of a series of focus groups with mid-career professionals and presidents in a range of colleges and universities regarding the need, content and structure for a higher educational doctoral program; a review of literature and review of doctoral programs in higher education at comparable institutions; the results of an earlier needs assessment survey of administrative staff serving the Maine Technical College System; consultation with internal faculty committees and consultation with the Educational Leadership faculty, and participant observation by the authors in each of the focus groups, consultative and policy settings.

The Case

Context

The University of Maine, like many institutions in the northeast and across the country, suffered from declining enrollments, reduced state funding and repeated budget reductions in the late 80s through the mid-90s. Budget rescissions, frozen faculty positions, administrator and faculty flight through early retirement inducements and more attractive job opportunities, downsizing and institutional reorganization characterized nearly a decade of life on the campus and throughout the University of Maine System. The impact on faculty and the academic governance processes maintained by faculty was significant in heightened levels of conflict, distrust of administration and general stress.

After a decade of doing more with less and suffering curtailments in program development, program elimination, and reductions in funds for research, and travel, consideration of new programs was rare. Faculty's first reaction to change of any kind was often a well conditioned protective response designed to defend the remaining elements of programs and academic life which had survived the decade.

Graduate programs in higher education, housed with the College of Education and Human Development were seriously threatened from the impact of reduced funding and reorganization. The College had offered a master's degree in Student Personnel in Higher Education since 1965 when the focus resided within the area of Counselor Education and was primarily the responsibility of one professor with a specialization in that area. In addition, students were able to earn the EdD focusing on student personnel in higher education within Counselor Education.

In 1984 , a second faculty member whose experience lay in higher education brought an academic focus in organizational theory related to both K-12 and higher education levels to the Educational Administration faculty. The position supplemented an area faculty which had just been authorized by the Board of Trustees to offer the EdD in Educational Leadership. Responding to pressures arising from the lack of doctoral programs in the state for higher education personnel, a few applicants who expressed interest in higher education administration were accepted for doctoral study in the Educational Leadership program and assigned to the new faculty member for program advice.

Subsequently, in 1986, the Student Personnel program was moved from Counselor Education to Educational Administration with the hope that programs in K-12 administration, Higher Education, and Student Personnel would be mutually supportive. The faculty member with a background in higher education took a position as Director of Equal Opportunity on campus and the Student Personnel program continued as a relatively autonomous program

within the area of Educational Leadership (as the Educational Administration area had come to be called).

Within several years of the move of the Student Personnel program to Educational Leadership, the area faculty agreed to a moratorium on further doctoral admissions to the program in student personnel due to insufficient faculty resources. The masters program continued with revisions to include the option of an administrative specialty.

Then, in academic year 1996-1997 the University, in a dramatic effort to adjust to a significantly lower level of state funding and tuition revenue, implemented a reorganization plan. The plan, called AFFIRM, reduced seven colleges to five and called for a self-examination of each unit and for each unit to sharply define its mission. In the College of Education this prompted a redefinition of mission to focus exclusively on K – 12 education. Further, during this reorganization, the School of Human Development was moved, without the full support of its faculty, to join the College of Education (henceforth the College of Education and Human Development or COEHD). The remaining masters program in Student Personnel in Higher Education program was seriously threatened, but survived after release of the initial plan proposing its elimination due to the integration and value of the program's interns in various University offices.

In 1996, the faculty member who, 10 years previously had left the College for central administration, expressed an interest to return to the College. The salary line would be supported centrally. The Dean responded positively to the possibility of using her return as an opportunity to reinstitute a doctoral program in Higher Education, the absence of which had been viewed as problematic by the growing Technical College System in the state as well as by the Student Life Division at the University which typically used graduate students from the Higher Education program for staffing. Thus, at the threshold of the effort to reinstitute a doctoral program in Higher Education there was a variety of forces potentially restraining and conducive to such an effort:

Potential restraining forces included:

- There was a high level of competition within the University of Maine System for resources and new programs in a period of declining resources. Further, competition was particularly heated between the University of Maine (UMaine) and the University of Southern Maine (USM). UMaine was the flagship campus and the only doctoral granting institution in the state. It is located in the less populated, more distant and less prosperous northern reaches of the state. On the other hand, the younger, brash University of Southern Maine is the "comprehensive", urban campus located in the largest city in the state (though scarcely a suburb by mid Atlantic standards), and is technically limited to the masters as the highest degree level.

- The masters program in Student Personnel was still a relatively isolated program and the domain of a single faculty member although now housed in Educational Leadership.

- The creation of new programs, particularly those requiring additional resources were unlikely to be approved by the College faculty or the University Administration.

- The Educational Leadership faculty had faced high demand for courses and programs and insufficient faculty resources were available to meet those demands. The loss of one faculty member to an independent institute and the impending loss of another to another institution generated anxiety in the remaining faculty that these resources would not be fully replaced.

- The College had been through a series of budget cutbacks and there was a variety of concerns related to how, and according to what priorities new growth should occur. Though demanding few new funds, the dean's commitment to program development in higher education leadership could potentially be interpreted by some to be unfaithful to priorities and processes previously determined by the faculty.

- A climate of discord existed within the Graduate Affairs Committee of the College which resulted in close scrutiny in applying rules and policies reflecting a history of situations where the judgments of some faculty were perceived by some members to be overly permissive.

- There were questions among some college and university leaders in the state about the ability of a college perceived as focusing on K-12 institutions to focus effectively on postsecondary institutions.

Simultaneously, there were several factors conducive to the reinstitution of doctoral study in Higher Education Leadership.

- Statewide, no doctoral program for leadership personnel in higher education existed in the state at a time when professional employees were increasing in numbers in both the University of Maine System and the Maine Technical College System. Further, interest in the possibility of in-state options for advanced professional education had been expressed in the early 90s by administrators with the Technical College system and, among women employed in higher education, at annual meetings of Maine's unit of the American Council on Education National Identification Project for women. A survey of technical college personnel indicated a clear need and willing students for such a program. However, reduced state funding for both the University and the Technical College system effectively stopped development of this effort.

- Just prior to the decade-long decline in state revenues to the University, the University had embarked on a major project renewing its on-campus computing and communications infrastructure. At the same time, the University of Maine System and the State had committed to enhancing digital networking capacity to facilitate communication and distance learning in the vast, sparsely populated geography of Maine which is made more challenging by a harsh winter climate.

- Leaders within the University had experienced support for a higher education leadership program and were willing to serve as adjunct faculty.

- Some of the faculty in Educational Leadership felt limited in their ability to satisfy the needs of students who had interests in higher education who took their K – 12 focused courses at advanced levels.

- The Educational Leadership program had a strong track record of being responsive and engaged with the field and had successfully developed a doctoral program that effectively blended theory and practice.

- There was strong support from the Dean of the College who viewed an EdD concentration in Higher Education as yet another means for the College to serve the needs of the state in a very visible manner.

- There were clear indications that the state's economy, and consequently State revenues, were beginning to recover from a decade long decline. In addition, the University had just implemented an early retirement program that allowed recovery of over 60 faculty

positions. A gift of $4 million for faculty positions from alumni authors, Stephen and Tabitha King, was going to allow the University to bridge the period when retiring faculty were still being paid. Thus, beginning in 1997, for the first time in several years, the University was able to add significant numbers of new faculty to its ranks providing a significant boost to low morale on the campus.

Thus, when the Dean considered the opportunity for gaining a faculty line with the return of the Equal Opportunity Director to the COEHD faculty, the timing offered some hope for a reconfigured doctoral concentration in Higher Education without the addition of significant College resources. He committed to a planning process that would produce a curriculum built "from the ground up" and responsive to the realities of the field.

Grass-roots based planning

In February of 1997, the Dean of the COEHD appointed a higher educational leadership planning committee charged to assess needs, examine potential curricular foci , resource needs, a structural niche within the COEHD and, depending on the proposed niche, identify the appropriate channels for approval. The Dean appointed the returning faculty member and his Associate Dean for Instruction to co-chair the committee. The committee ultimately consisted of 19 members representing the field of potential employers including both two and four year institutions in the state as well as the University of Maine System office, potential students, and current faculty at the University, primarily from the COEHD. While the gender composition of the group was fairly even, the three Presidents and the System's Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs were all women. Two people of color were members of the group--a number disproportionately high for the state of Maine and its University system, but lower than the ideal. Others in the group included University of Maine administrative staff who had taught in the Masters program in Higher Education and who had advocated for its survival and for the establishment of the doctoral program. In short, the group represented the landscape of stakeholders in reestablishment of a doctoral program in Higher Education in Maine.

The Advisory Committee met initially in April 1997. Its discussion was spirited and highly supportive of the need for a higher educational leadership program to serve the state and region. Based on that discussion which emphasized the need to be responsive to the field, a series of focus groups were planned to seek feedback from those who would be served by such a program, either as students, attendees at conferences and institutes or as employers of its graduates. That feedback was to address the need and perceptions regarding needed content and structure.

Subsequently, in October 1997, the Advisory Committee co-chairs met with four focus groups at locations around the state. Three groups consisted of mid-career professionals and administrators at campuses within the state. Attendance varied from approximately 40 to 15 to 2. The fourth focus group was at a state-wide meeting of the Maine Higher Education Council made up of the presidents of all public and private postsecondary institutions in the state attended by about 25 president, representing a significant majority of the state's colleges and universities.

The following questions served as the initial agenda for each focus group. However, in each case, a agenda was modified as discussion evolved.

"• Could graduate level education serve as a resource in the professional development of personnel at your institution(s)?

- If yes, what kind of positions do personnel hold who might benefit from the program?
- If no, how do staff at your institution become prepared for the roles they play?

"•What knowledge and skills do you find yourself needing for continued professional growth and success?

"•Can you cite any additional or different knowledge and skills which you seek or seek in those whom you employ?

"•Consider program structure. What advice would you offer to assure a program that is relevant, effective and accessible to mid-career professionals in your institution?

"•Consider underlying philosophy of education--given classes serving mid-career professionals, do you think there are any basic principles that should guide the faculty as they design individual courses (as well as the curriculum)?

"•To what extent do you think internships should be included to provide exposure to new responsibilities and mentoring?

•Would you be willing and/or able to leave your current job for a semester or year's internship at low or no compensation?

"•What do you think are the most critical issues facing higher education as we enter the next century that should be considered in shaping a graduate program?

"•A graduate program can enhance higher education in Maine through degree programs. What are other needs you would hope a graduate program could address to support higher education in the state (e.g. policy research, conferences, institutes etc.

"•Other comments, especially those related to the existing masters program:"

The notes made on butcher block paper at each meeting were consolidated, coded by location and integrated into a single list (Appendix A) consolidating as the data dictated into categories including perceived need, needed content, faculty and structural needs. In addition, a survey instrument was designed to allow those who could not attend meetings to provide input. Given the prior survey of Technical College System staff, a full-scale effort was not made to survey staff. Instead, efforts were made to encourage meeting attendance and to raise awareness about the planning process through the meeting invitations.

The results demonstrated convergence of opinion in the need for a doctoral program, and, generally, for the content and structure. In content, the perceived needs were much as expected: Areas related to understanding colleges and universities as complex organizations, understanding colleges and universities in the larger social, historical and political context; understanding modern technology and its impact in colleges and universities; and lots of professional knowledge and skill areas related to leading and managing programs and institutions. An internet review of higher education programs and a review of literature suggested that the recommended content areas were fairly typical with the exception of mastering technology--which is most likely represented in the current curricula at surveyed institutions though not necessarily reflected on web pages.

More divergent, however, from paper descriptions of many University based programs was the very clear and very loud emphases regarding structure and delivery. Advisory Committee members and focus group respondents alike called for structures to increase

accessibility for working professionals through flexibility in scheduling, innovative residency requirements, creative structuring of classes and the judicious use of new technologies to help reduce travel time while optimizing learning time. Flexibility was a theme that had been reflected as well in the 1994 Technical College survey results. In addition, respondents called for a kind of figurative accessibility for mid-career professionals with an emphasis on practicality and application in individual courses and the overall curriculum.

In addition to the structure and content categories emerging from the data, there was a concern for the nature and approach of the faculty. Many called for at least some faculty who themselves had the credibility, hands-on knowledge and understanding they perceived associated with being practicing administrators. They sought faculty who could effectively bridge theory and practice, understood "the real world", were current in their field, and were excellent teachers, modeling in their own teaching the substance of what they taught. Those aspiring to advanced graduate work appeared aware of the commitment it demanded but in return they expected to be respected for the expertise they brought with them and to see immediate applicability of their academic experience to the work setting.

The Advisory Committee co-chairs left these meetings filled with imaginative discussions about alternative program delivery with such elements as on-line, asynchronous components, interactive video courses, and even the use of interactive video on personal computers. They envisioned courses taught and co-taught by faculty who had moved back and forth between the realms of administration and faculty. And they envisioned faculty committed to the kind of experiential learning so clearly valued by focus group participants.

Program development

With the convergence between the Advisory Committee and the focus group discussions, the co-chairs proceeded to (1) define the implications for the field feedback for the content, structure and niche for a higher educational leadership doctoral program; (2) review doctoral requirements within the College of Education and Human Development that would define the parameters for a program (or would represent areas for proposed change); (3) assess the COEHD for potential fit either within an existing curricular area as a standalone program agreeing that in philosophy, experience and faculty expertise the Educational Leadership area offered the most appropriate fit; (4) review requirements of doctoral programs in Higher Education at other institutions (5) review literature regarding the status, substance and evolution of higher education as a field of doctoral study; (6) study, in depth, through reading and discussion the structure and content of the existing Educational Leadership EdD program; (7) draft a program description and curriculum to propose to the advisory committee integrating elements from these sources.

At this stage, the niche question was addressed by envisioning the program as a concentration within the Educational Leadership program. It was already the home of the initial faculty, and the Educational Leadership faculty shared a philosophical commitment comparable to that sought by those who participated in the higher education focus groups. A niche as a concentration within an existing degree program would also have the effect of limiting the policy arenas from which approval would be needed to the COEHD faculty and administration and sparing the layers of campus and system level approval, up to and including the Board of Trustees, that would be necessary to initiate a new program.

A mission statement consistent with both that of Educational Leadership and feedback from the field was drafted: The mission of the doctoral concentration (EdD) in Higher Educational Leadership was defined as: "*to educate competent and visionary leaders for postsecondary educational institutions in Maine and beyond. The curriculum is designed to develop and sustain in practice leaders who collaborate with, inspire, and exemplify for*

others the best qualities of learning, ethical conduct, and commitment to student and faculty development. To these ends, the Higher Educational Leadership faculty provides graduate degree programs; serves as a resource to individuals, institutions, and government agencies on current theory and practice, and research related to higher education; and tries to model learning, ethical conduct, inclusiveness and commitment to its students and the higher education community in Maine and beyond."

If there were no constraints, the program envisioned by the co-chairs to meet this mission as they returned from the spirited focus groups encompassed: (1) no arbitrary or irrelevant requirements, (2) assessment of knowledge rather than prior credit hours as representative of prior knowledge, (3) employed creative scheduling and technology in a variety of imaginative ways to increase learning time and communication while reducing commuting time, (4) supported the creation of a collaborative network of students through common experiences and a shared knowledge base (5) allowed partial individualization of the program to meet individual professional needs and aspirations, (6) actively engaged effective administrators as ongoing faculty members, and (7) active interplay for the students between classes and practice. However, the fact of embarking upon program development within a particular educational and policy context demanded a fit between the ideal and the possible. As the co-chairs began to formally define the program, elements of structure and process were initially framed through the University, COEHD and the Educational Leadership doctoral guidelines.

Through channels....

The decision to propose a concentration within the Educational Leadership program provided a flexible template for the program consistent with COEHD and graduate school requirements. The COEHD required 90 hours beyond the bachelors for the EdD within which 21 hours were College requirements including Social Context of Education, Philosophy of Education, Advanced Educational Psychology, Statistical Methods in Education, Educational Research, Advanced Educational Research and Qualitative Research. The College's residency requirement for students who were working consisted of at least four consecutive semesters enrolled in full-time study (defined by the graduate school as 6 hours).

A significant number of the College requirements could appear irrelevant to students focusing on postsecondary institutions. Based on the differences in colleges and universities from elementary and secondary schools, the evolving proposal sought to substitute the requirement for the course Social Context of Education with a section specific to higher education. The proposal also sought to eliminate the requirement for philosophy of education and advanced psychology to have the content addressed in a more applicable way within initial core doctoral seminars.

As initially envisioned, the Educational Leadership degree had been broad and flexible in its structure. Thus, its framework was readily adaptable to a higher education focus. Early discussions by the Advisory Committee co-chairs with the Educational Leadership faculty were fit into full area agendas leaving time for brief reports, a few questions and little substantive discussion. In short, consideration of the Higher Educational Leadership proposal became a minor item on the Educational Leadership agenda in the face of more immediately pressing concerns. The Educational Leadership faculty was consistent in expressing concern for a heavy workload that could be strained even more without additional faculty and with an additional concentration requiring time-intensive doctoral advising with a group of students with which the faculty did not feel fully competent to deal. Based on this feedback, the concentration was designed to be staffed by returning or new faculty in higher education, carefully selected effective practicing administrators, and faculty in appropriate disciplines in other areas of the University with an interest in higher education e.g. economics,

communication and business. The co-chairs thus began discussions with both faculty in other departments and well-regarded administrators seeking potential interest in teaching specific courses within the program.

The College had a history of using adjunct faculty to teach some courses to fill in when regular faculty were not available. After listening to the focus groups, the co-chairs sought a way to more fully integrate practicing administrators into the concentration without being exploitative of their time nor insensitive to their autonomy. They developed a set of "commitments" (Appendix B) that would reflect the expectation for ongoing engagement with the concentration and a commitment to the integration of some key themes elicited in the focus groups in their courses as appropriate e.g. written and oral communication, problem-solving, critical thinking, use of alternative structures and technologies, ethics and diversity.

Attendance at a meeting of the Graduate Affairs Committee (GAC) of the College on December 16 met with lukewarm approval of the concept after extensive questions about resources, funding, and a perceived shift in college priorities by the Dean without full consultation with faculty. The Co-Chairs left the meeting to prepare for a meeting three days later with the Advisory Committee. Draft material presented at the GAC did not discuss innovative teaching techniques, alternative technologies or creative scheduling nor did the discussion elicit them. Given the responsibility of faculty for the content and structure of individual classes, discussion of teaching technologies appeared both premature and inappropriate to the committee's charge. The committee focused instead on assurances that traditional standards would be met and with sufficient resources to do so.

The Higher Education Advisory Committee strongly endorsed the draft concentration. It further suggested thinking in new ways about flexibility in delivery such as breaking down the consistent pattern of packaging knowledge in 3 credit courses when a combination of one credit institutes could provide exposure to some key skill areas without requiring the commitment of a full semester. This discussion also sharpened the vision of a series of core courses taken in common, and an individualized specialization component with some central themes/skills transcending courses as appropriate e.g. written and oral communication, use of technology, and inquiry.

Based on the GAC and Advisory Committee meetings as well as meetings with the Educational Leadership faculty the proposal was refined further and prepared for formal presentation to the Graduate Affairs Committee. At the February 17, 1998 GAC meeting the co-chairs presented a curricular proposal with supporting documentation, a proposal for two new courses, a proposal to waive COEHD requirements of Philosophy of Education and Advanced Educational Psychology for Higher Education doctoral students and a recommendation to initiate admissions to the doctoral concentration in higher education leadership with a May 1, 1998 deadline. In addition, the first cooperating faculty member was proposed for the concentration, the recent Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs who had returned to the faculty in Communications. By the time the agenda item was discussed, most of those attending the meeting had left. After a brief discussion the four remaining members of the GAC voted to recommend to the COEHD faculty approval of the concentration.

Ten days later, on February 27, the Higher Educational Leadership recommendation was reported out of the GAC for a faculty vote. After considerable discussion of the history of the moratorium on doctoral admissions in higher education, the Educational Leadership faculty was asked its position on reopening the concentration. The response was that there had been insufficient discussion within the area for a position to that point. The faculty then voted to table the proposal subject to further discussion and a recommendation by the Educational Leadership faculty.

Over the two months, the faculty co-chair met at least weekly with the Educational Leadership faculty to discuss, shape and refine the concentration (Appendix C). At times the Dean and Associate Dean also met with the group to consider especially issues related to faculty resources for the Educational Leadership as a whole as well as the Higher Education concentration within it. The Dean provided assurances about the filling of two positions becoming vacant and a third that was anticipated due to retirement. In preparation for the April 30 faculty meeting when the revised proposal would be considered, the co-chairs sent program materials with a cover letter to the faculty (April 28, 1998) to provide context for the discussion. Their letter noted key elements of the proposal as follows:

"•This is a student-centered program for mid-career professionals in diverse higher education settings. Students will have the opportunity to collaborate with faculty in considering course offerings, research and consultation, and other activities related to the culture of the concentration.

"•The concentration will integrate cooperating faculty as valuable, unique and ongoing resources rather than as contingency instructors. These faculty members will be included in colloquia and calibration meetings with full time faculty and will become actively involved with program planning and student research.

"•Active efforts will be made by students and faculty to use modern technologies in teaching and research.

"•Two full-time faculty positions will be assigned to the program [one an existing faculty position and the other the returning administrator noted as funded by the University.]"

The letter to the faculty also summarized changes in the proposal subsequent to the February 26 meeting of the faculty:

"•A two semester doctoral seminar has been defined to insure in-depth foundational study related to higher education.

"•Instead of adapting existing courses to a Higher Education constituency, courses specific to this concentration have been defined with HED designators.

"•The concentration has been more clearly delineated with a Professional Core (15 cr.), Research Foundations (12 cr.), Specialization (18 cr. min.), Internship and Thesis (2-6 cr.)

"•A decision has been made to admit students beginning January of 1999 and then in alternating academic years beginning in the Fall of 2001."

The Educational Leadership faculty facilitated the presentation and discussion of the proposal at the faculty meeting with elements presented by Educational Leadership faculty and the co-chairs. This participation as well as the formal endorsement clearly conveyed the support of the Educational Leadership faculty for the proposal. The proposal passed with a nearly unanimous vote.

Summary observations

The foregoing processes yielded both convergence and contradictions in the elements expected in a higher education leadership program. There was greater convergence in expectations for the focus of the program among external constituents, including employers and potential students, than among College of Education and Human Development faculty. Presidents, other potential employers, and mid-career professionals who would be potential students were unified in their appeal for a practical focus that would enhance the day-to-day

administrative and leadership skills of the students in the program and enhance the capacity of institutions. These included, among others, writing, interpersonal and critical thinking skills in addition to finance, decision making, planning, and policy processes specific to colleges and universities.

External constituents were uniformly concerned about a program design that would allow convenient access for working professionals. They urged the use of new technologies such as interactive television, the worldwide web, creative scheduling, and coursework which would respect and integrate the students' daily "laboratory" experience provided naturally by their institutional work settings. Concern was expressed, with an undercurrent of skepticism, about the ability of "ivory tower" academics to truly meet their practical needs. There was a clear desire for flexibility in scheduling and individual programs to meet the diverse professional and personal needs of students. Finally, those in the field sought faculty with strong experiential backgrounds to meet the foregoing needs. There was enthusiasm and a clearly expressed need for a higher education leadership program in a state where distances otherwise limited such opportunities for professional growth.

There was less convergence among faculty involved in academic decision making processes. This reflected, perhaps, the diversity of interests and priorities represented among faculty from a variety of disciplines. The heightened sensitivity produced by a decade of institutional downsizing was also a contributing factor.

Academic decision processes internal to the university can be characterized as layers of shared governance assuring faculty input and standards at various institutional levels. This case study documents the unintended pressures these processes imposed on program design. Even though they allowed for course level innovation, and demanded an assurance of quality in the delivery of the program, they forced a field sensitive program design to give the appearance of fitting a traditional university mold. The process of interpreting a field sensitive to faculty with a variety of academic backgrounds demanded a high level of clarity and accountability in program design. External constituents, on the other hand, perceiving the potential of advancing their education within the state, and having had some input into the program design, were less demanding and more trusting.

It must be noted that this case describes a story that could, at any given point in its evolution, evolved in totally different directions. Such chance variations as changes in the numbers of participants and interests at key meetings, negative attention from potential competitors outside the college or institution, or even positive external attention seeking to shape the curriculum in different directions could have led this case down very different paths. The seemingly random patterns of participation, competing problems, solutions and choice opportunities in any given situation create the demand for flexibility, persistence and tolerance of ambiguity in organizational change efforts. This uniqueness is reminder of the limits to generalizability from individual case studies. Yet, a case study provides rich description illustrating specific phenomena, in this case, the erosion of the appearance of innovation and responsiveness to the field as the innovation fit itself through academic decision processes.

Conclusions and implications

The aggregate impact of internal university processes, including layers of standards and formats, was a homogenizing effect on the appearance of the program design and structure. Rather than stifling innovation, this forced the innovative concepts emerging from the field into individual course units where academic norms and traditions provide the greatest freedom Within the course unit faculty control such elements as use of innovative technologies for access, innovative scheduling and reality-based content.

This suggests that the key to academic innovation may be at the smallest unit i.e. the individual course and not primarily in the big picture represented by the program design. Yet, the "big picture" is essential for providing program coherence and a sense of integrity for the students it serves. The quality of a program, therefore, depends on faculty commitment to an overall philosophy and ability to translate that philosophy into innovative classroom practice.

The analysis of this case study suggests some specific implications for the successful curricular change efforts as listed below:

- Academic change efforts require: (1) sensitivity to context, (2) flexibility to respond to the unpredictable demands produced by the interplay of complex internal and external forces at a particular point in time and (3) persistence to continue in the face of unpredictable challenges.

- Program design that is sensitive to the many constituencies to which it is accountable requires faculty to connect their knowledge and skills to a field-based philosophy and will provide vehicles for that to occur (e.g. shared faculty commitments regarding course structure and philosophy; colloquia involving students, external constituents, and faculty; and routine engagement of cooperating faculty in discussions related to student progress.)

- Special attention must be given to such vehicles to assure programmatic coherence and integrity. This is of paramount importance when cooperating faculty, who are practicing professionals with valuable expertise yet limited time and availability, are an integral part of the program.

- The ability of academic programs in higher education to serve credibly the interests of the field depend on clear and complete communication with those external constituencies we intend to serve and those internal constituencies to whom we are accountable. Given that the interests and perspectives of internal and external constituents will not necessarily be shared, it is important for faculty to serve as interpreters and a bridge between the two. Thus, they will simultaneously serve the interest of change and learning.

REFERENCES

Cohen, Michael D. and March, James G. 1974. Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president. New York: McGraw Hill.

Cooper, Jack H. (1986, February). Higher education as a field of study: some future prospects. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.

Crosson, Patricia H; Nelson, Glenn M. (1986) A Profile of Higher Education Doctoral Programs. Review of Higher Education, 9 (3), 335-57.

Fincher, Cameron. The possibilities and actualities of disciplined inquiry. Research in Higher Education, 32, (6). 625-650.

Nelson, Glenn M. (1991). Higher education doctoral programs: a demographic portrait. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 76 (Administration as a Profession) 19 (4), 69-76.

Newell, L. J. & Morgan, D.A. (1983). The evolving higher education professoriate: Implications for ASHE. Review of higher education. 7, 67-83.

Peters, Dianne S., Peterson, Margaret. (1987, November). Rites of passage for doctoral students in higher education. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.

Rhodes, Gary. (1997, Fall). Key questions to curricular relevance. Association for the Study of Higher Education Newsletter 10, (3),

Townsend, Barbara K.; Wiese, Michael D. (1991). The higher education doctorate as a passport to higher education administration. New Directions for Higher Education, No. 76 (Administration as a Profession) 19 (4), 5-13.

Townsend, Barbara K. (1990). Doctoral study in the field of higher education. In J. Smart (Ed.), Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. VI. (pp. 161-199). New York: Agathon Press.

Appendix A

Integrated and Consolidated Responses from Focus Groups

INTEGRATED LIST OF FOCUS GROUPS RESPONSES

Codes: •• (Bar Harbor meeting of Presidents), - (EMTC meeting of regional)administrators, • (Meeting of regional adm. Univ. of Me. Oct. 7), *Advisory Committee, ≠KMTC (president and dept chair)

NEED AND RATIONALE FOR PROGRAM

Building Institutional Capacity and Individual Professional Development

•• For programs in discipline, – Access to advanced degrees

•• Currently need to draw "from away" because we have no way to "grow our own";
- To help us "Grow Our Own"

- Yes: there's a need, • Focus on Doctoral Level

- On Job Training = typical route to higher educational management roles, (we need ways to supplement and strengthen with broader more professional knowledge for both institutional development and to enhance individual career mobility.)

* Many administrators, often nonacademic, in state–with masters (place bound): needs for professional development for current job, and to expand career options

- Program/job design skills*Shaping future/Leadership
(Evolving jobs)- Enhance skills on job

* "Industry needs"
  – Center for Study/Policy
    e.g. re: Trends
  – Policy
  – Conferences, institutes and ≠workshops, staff development
  •• Conference/Institutes for practicing professionals

* Student Affairs at UM/USM (+/- 20), others

FOCUS/CONTENT

FOUNDATION/OVERVIEW/SOCIALIZATION

•• Mission/Vision: Understanding **context/philosophy**, - Institutional/Wholistic Perspective, *History/context of higher education,*Institutional perspective: "Big Picture", * Need for broader perspective, - Deeper view - of education as a whole and articulation between K-12 - Higher Education • Connect with K-12 articulation issues•• **Landscape** of professional associations, - National standards/organizations/accred./professional associations* Broad-based to be prepared for national perspective/populations

* Exposure to national contexts, • Social/Political Context
- Broad view of higher education - similarities/differences in types of postsecondary institutions and in k-12 v. postsecondary

• Consciously Inclusive/Focus on **Diversity**

•• **Ethics:** in personal and institutional decision-making and practices, *Ethics

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- **Development/Public relations**, Marketing• Public Relations/External Media/Presentation, , •• Media, •• Fundraising/Development • Internal/External Marketing (Effective), • Grant Writing/Fundraising,* Fundraising, *Marketing

- **Governmental relations/Policy/Politics,** -Legislature/International Relations-Local/State/National/Global Economy and implications for higher education, • Environmental Assessment (Physical & Organizational, Political)*Policy/Politics, ≠policy research

•• Risk Management/**Law**,- Legal framework/HEd Law,• Law/Compliance Issues, ≠Health and safety issues

- **Collective bargaining,**•• Collective Bargaining-all aspects, ≠legal issues/risk assessment/prevention

KNOWLEDGE RE: INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL;

•• **Understanding Academic enterprise/governance**, •• Role/Work of Trustees
• Understanding Colleges, Non -Profit & Universities as Complex Organizations
Understanding the enterprise,*Understanding/moving organizations, ≠grounding in higher education

Students• Students/Student Development, - Student development services and rationale cost, etc., * Student growth and development, ≠student services issues
- Enrollment management, (Diversity–age, culture, etc.)

- Curriculum Development/innovative techniques, etc., * Teaching in Higher Education

•• **Leadership** - "What's it mean to be..." - Leadership tools/Technique- Quality Management Tools and Techniques, •• Focus on "Leadership" vs. Cookbook
• Understanding (self) analysis of Leadership Styles (including of Gender/Race/Class Differences), •• Leadership models - ability to reflect on self institution case studies

•• **Decision-Making**...(practice vs theory: often in context of "heat," emotions, politics)

•• Possible disciplinary base? (MAT model...e.g. literature as source of critical thinking)

• **Strategic Planning**•• Strategic & L.R. Planning with practical (focus), *Strategic Planning

- Education Organizational behavior (understanding/mediating organizational cultures),•• Understanding of Human Behavior, • Organizational Development, - Change Theory/dynamics of **change**, • Innovation & Change

- **Personnel/Management/H.R.** • Budget & Personnel Issues/Interrelationship Human Resource Management/Incentives, •• HR management for risk management/prevention •• Performance Based Evaluation, ≠personnel evaluation, ≠using evaluation as a personnel development tool, • Accountability Practices, *Personnel Management, *Supervision/Personnel selection, ≠hiring,

• **Financial Management/Economics**•• Finance/Administration of Resources,
- Facilities Management,- Fund Management ,- Business/Financial skills,*Accounting/Budgeting; ≠resource development
•• Awareness of Resources re: Law, Budgets, Educational Technology

•• **Research Design/Criticism,** * Analysis/statistics, ≠Evaluation, ≠program and curriculum assessment • Introducing Research Base

INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

•• **Problem-solving,**• Personal and Professional Problem Solving & Decision Making; *Decision Making/Problem-solving
- Creative thinking/critical thinking skills/creative problem solving methods•• Critical thinking

*Tolerance of ambiguity/chaos * Understanding/ ability to function in environments increasingly marked by apparent chaos

•• Working knowledge of **technology**, - M.I.S. - Technology,- Technology and pedagogy, • Information Technology,- Require computers, * Mgt. of Info. Technology, delivery of instructional technology, *Instructional technologies/curriculum development * Understanding trends: Technology
* Understanding trends: Distance education,≠applying technology

•• **Communication/Interpersonal Skills**, •• Human relations, Motivational Theory - People skills - ≠ Team Building/Collaborative skills, - Presentation/facilitation skills (specify teaching opportunities), • Collaboration Skills, • Mediation/Conflict Resolution,•• Negotiating/Mediation skills, * Communication: Written, Oral, relating with Media, *Negotiation, ≠conflict resolution

• Mentoring/Modeling Skills (Human Technology Concept) ≠discipline,

•• Stress Management "Managing Life"•• "Reflective practitioners",

•• Where to find what you don't learn. How to continue learning

•• Consider out of class experiences (outward), - Paid **internship** - different from current job - Under competent leadership

STRUCTURE

•• Flexibility,- Flexibility, - Flexibility, • Flexibility/Variety of Approaches, * Flexibility in delivery, •• NOT cookie cutter: Flexibility ; ≠flexibility essential--cold be thru directed study, ITV, creative scheduling to minimize commuting/maximizing contact; cont

- Accommodate schedules/alternatives and parallels, - Accommodate work,
    •• Nontraditional times

(Re: combination of flexibility, accommodating work, technology, asyncronicity [is that a word?], being competitive re: credit hour requirements: "If you don't give it to us we can and will simply go to institutions that will." e.g. Phoenix University etc.)

• Capitalize on Technology, • Combine Contact time/Technology, - New technologies
•• Asynchonous component, ≠use technology for face to face contact important as well/courses should not be offered wholly on net, ≠new kinds of learning responsive to student needs;

*Experience based course and curricular structure- Cross different experiental/educational bases, - Vary delivery form, • Non-traditional Approaches •• Functional Focus

* Practical exposure on home campus or elsewhere (ACE Fellows model), *Reality base from the first practica in different institutions, - Connectedness with employers to whom we send students

- Design curriculum around "teams", collaboration, ≠learning should be collaborative; project oriented, - Adult learning

* Student centered learning: "affirming what we know", •• Value/use expertise of students.≠respect for student experience; some peer education

Individualized experiences (To meet different needs, interests, professional foci.)
• Internship/applied Experience≠should be integral part of program
    - Define Substantively/Carefully
    - Look at Existing Models - Job Swaps

*PDS - Professional Development Schools--possible models

•• Mentoring "depends"

•• Cohorts work! • Core - may limit flexibility vs. competing demands and structure

•• Niche marketing

- Formal structure for networking,- Ease study analysis

• Make it quick!! • Testing Out, - Look at admissions to focus on competencies/knowledge

• Clarity in program/ongoing orientation support

• Early Connection Between Theory & Research,

•• Prerequisite: Life experience

FACULTY

• Faculty Resources: Concern Re: Multicultural

- Faculty as facilitators, - Facilitate Sharing of knowledge,- Exposures to active working professionals, - State as classroom,

*Strong practitioner base in faculty, •• Some practitioners as instructors

• Visiting Faculty/Visiting Courses

• Support/Mentoring/Advisement from Faculty

- Faculty keep current/change,- "Use what you teach", * Faculty-Modeling what expected of students

Other:
•• Location: Not in Shibles (Honors Center? Corbett?)•• "Place for leaders..."
•• "Beware wannabes" (ie. those concerned with status vs. substance)

Analysis: Consistency toward integrating across categories: re: theory/practice, technology, communication, flexibility

Observation: Similar skill areas but Presidents more likely to focus on critical thinking and problem solving while teaching what resources exist and how to access them; mid-level professionals more likely to want to gain expertise in specific skill areas (perceived as necessary).

(note: This list does not reflect length or seriousness of discussion of specific items. That "weighting" occurred through the participation of the committee co-chairs in facilitating the focus groups.]

Appendix B

University of Maine

College of Education and Human Development

Commitments for Higher Educational Leadership Faculty

In order to deliver the kind of program described in the overview, there are some consistent expectations to be provided in the delivery of individual courses as listed below. In addition, programmatic coherence, with a concentration benefitting from adjunct and cooperating faculty, will demand some occasional extracurricular involvement of adjunct faculty beyond preparing and teaching individual courses. The list below represents a list of expectations for all faculty serving the Higher Education Concentration.

- Willingness to meet as part of a full program faculty once or twice a year...and willingness to meet as a faculty with student cohort once or twice a year (possibly as partially social event or in a colloquium setting depending on student interests.)

- Willingness to consult informally with students, and, as mutually agreeable, serve on doctoral committees.

- Willingness to consult with full-time faculty regarding student progress and programmatic development.

- Read and be familiar with the COEHD **Guidelines for Doctoral Study and Advising.**

- Willingness to explore alternate time and delivery structures.

- Appropriate use of new technologies to enhance communications, increase flexibility in structure, and to provide exposure to cutting edge in teaching, learning and communications.

- Include opportunities in classes for students to enhance collaborative skills.

- Work to elicit practical implications for theory e.g. through case studies, role plays, simulations, analysis within student work settings, etc.

- Work to infer theoretical implications from accounts of practice (to broaden vision, practice value of theory as analysis tool, understanding "big picture".)

- Classes will serve as settings to build writing skills which reflect critical thinking, clarity and professionalism appropriate to both scholarly research and administrative communications.

- Classes will serve as settings to build interpersonal communication skills, including appreciating diversity, conflict resolution, public speaking , teaching and persuasion skills.

- Address ethical implications of decision processes as applicable.

- Model those things we teach: collaboration, ethics, respect for others, rigorous thinking, commitment to a linkage between theory and practice, and responsible communication.

- Provide prompt feedback to student inquiries and work.

4/15/98

Appendix C

University of Maine
College of Education and Human Development

Doctor of Education Concentration in Higher Educational Leadership

April 1998

The mission of the doctoral concentration (EdD) in Higher Educational Leadership is *"to educate competent and visionary leaders for postsecondary educational institutions in Maine and beyond. The curriculum is designed to develop and sustain in practice leaders who collaborate with, inspire, and exemplify for others the best qualities of learning, ethical conduct, and commitment to student and faculty development. To these ends, the Higher Educational Leadership faculty provides graduate degree programs; serves as a resource to individuals, institutions, and government agencies on current theory and practice, and research related to higher education; and tries to model learning, ethical conduct, inclusiveness and commitment to its students and the higher education community in Maine and beyond."*

The EdD concentration in Higher Educational Leadership will enhance and broaden the leadership knowledge and skills of mid-career professionals within colleges and universities and other settings serving advanced learning needs. Its goal is to help leaders develop knowledge, interpersonal skills, values and awareness that will enable them to influence positively the functioning and educational outcomes of the institutions they serve. Through its structure and content the concentration is intended to (1) enhance both individual professional skills and vision; (2) enhance institutional capacities through more skilled leadership at all levels; (3) develop collaborative networks of professional resources and support through colleagues, faculty, and resource people with whom students have contact; and (4) provide a forum for analysis of regional and national problems in higher education and for advancing solutions to those problems.

Graduates of the Higher Educational Leadership Concentration will provide leadership characterized by:

- High levels of critical thinking, analysis, and problem-solving skills;
- ethics-based decision making;
- highly effective persuasive and inclusive written and oral communication skills in one-on-one, small group and large group situations;
- an understanding of colleges and universities as complex organizations;
- an appreciation of the social context of higher education and its impact on the internal functioning of a postsecondary organization (including current and historical dimensions of social, demographic, economic, political and legal trends);
- an ability to be an influential actor in the technological evolution and transformation of higher education and society; and

- flexibility and a tolerance of ambiguity needed to provide leadership in a time of profound institutional and societal change.

The student's program will consist of a variety of group and individualized experiences culminating in the dissertation including:

(1) The **Professional Core**: a broad, common strand of course work and experiences (18 credit hours)

(2) **Research Foundation:** a set of courses to provide expertise in evaluating and conducting research in educational settings (a minimum of 12 credit hours)

(3) **Professional specialization:** a set of interdisciplinary courses tailored, to the individual professional goals, needs and interests (a minimum of 18 credit hours)

(4) an applied **internship** or **field research**, and

(5) **dissertation research** structured to solve problems or produce knowledge with direct applicability to higher educational practice (a minimum of 6 credit hours).

The structure of the program is defined by the EdD requirements in the parent Educational Leadership program generally entailing 90 credit hours past the bachelors degree. The disciplinary backgrounds and the applied experience mid-career students bring with them will be central to the learning environment. Students will be expected to learn from one another as well as from faculty and others with specific expertise in areas of higher education.

Coursework will connect theory with practice employing case study methods, experiential learning, writing, interpersonal interaction, and analysis. A common core of seminars related to higher educational leadership will provide a base of knowledge, theory, analysis skills, and leadership skills related to higher education and leadership. Core emphases in written and oral communications, ethics, technology and its applications in teaching, learning and administration, collaboration, problem-solving, political and organizational analysis, the dynamics of diversity, conflict resolution, collaboration, critical thinking and problem solving will be addressed in streams across courses as well in individual courses. Consideration of dissertation research will begin in the first semester of doctoral study so that subsequent coursework can more effectively build toward this culminating effort.

A selection of professional specialty courses tailored to the individual student's research and professional aspirations will build on the professional core courses. Research courses further prepare the student for doctoral level research and provide analysis skills for the professional setting.

Comprehensive Examinations assess mastery of core and specialty knowledge as well as writing and analysis skills appropriate for beginning dissertation research.

Faculty consists of a core of full-time faculty in Educational Leadership including two with specific expertise in higher education; faculty from related disciplines within the College of Education and Human Development and from other areas of the University; and practicing administrators who have demonstrated excellence in their fields as well as strong teaching skills. Adjunct and cooperating faculty broaden the range of perspectives, knowledge and experiences to which students are exposed. Institutes carrying varying course credits will supplement traditional 3 credit courses to intensively address specific professional issues.

The program, flexible in content and structure, is designed to meet the needs of working professionals. Given the emphasis on exploring and using new teaching and learning technologies, students will be expected to have computer access to the internet and a subscription to the **Chronicle of Higher Education** providing electronic access to the Chronicle, and the archives and databases on its website.

Contacts: **Suzanne Estler, Associate Professor, phone: 207-581-2416**
Walter Harris, Professor and Associate Dean, phone: 207-581-2467

College of Education and Human Development
Shibles Hall
University of Maine
Orono, Maine 04469

BEST COPY AVAILABLE